

Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1-3, 9, 19, 22, and 25 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added.

Claims 4, 7, and 18 were previously canceled. Therefore, claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-17, and 19-27 are presented for examination.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejection

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Office Action asserts that the limitation “the third form” in claim 25 lacks antecedent basis. Claim 25 has been amended to recite “the hidden form” in lieu of “the third form”. Therefore, claim 25 does have sufficient antecedent basis. As such, applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-17, and 19-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,651,217) in view of Markus et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,601). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Kennedy in view of Markus.

Kennedy discloses a system for populating a plurality of fields appearing on a form such as an HTML-based form rendered on a browser. When a user first populates a form and submits it for processing, a web browser employing the inventive principles determines

whether the user has completed a profile containing commonly used fields. If no profile has been completed, data values from the form populated by the user are extracted, matched to the commonly used fields, and used to populate the profile, which is stored for future use. Thereafter, when the user displays the same or a different form, the user is given the option to automatically populate the form using values stored in the profile. (Kennedy at Abstract.)

Markus discloses a system for constructing and transmitting an executable software module on a personal information server to a remote computer. The software module is constructed such that once received by a browser displaying a form, it is executed and user data is automatically inserted into an electronic form. The software module contains field names from a downloaded form and matching data items which are inserted into the form on the remote user computer. (Markus at Abstract.)

Claim 1 recites:

A method, comprising:

displaying a first page having a first form and a hidden form;

receiving user-provided data into the first form of the first page;

displaying a second form of a second page when the second form is requested via the first page

receiving user-provided data into the second form of the second page;

copying the data from the second form of the second page to the hidden form of the first page without posting the data from the second form to a server; and

posting the data from the first form and the hidden form to the server when the first page is submitted.

Applicant submits that Kennedy does not disclose or suggest copying data from a second form of a second page to a hidden form of a first page without posting the data from the second form to a server, as recited by claim 1. The Office Action acknowledges as much when stating “Kennedy does not explicitly disclose ‘copying the data to a hidden form from the second page’.” (Office Action mailed 1/3/06 at pg. 3, point 6.) However, the Office

Action does cite Markus as teaching “copying data to a hidden form of the second page.”

(Id.)

Applicant further submits that Markus does not disclose or suggest copying data from a second form of a second page to a hidden form of a first page without posting the data from the second form to a server. The Office Action relies on Markus at column 12, lines 25-35 to disclose this feature. Yet, this cited portion of Markus discloses a privacy bank server sending a message to a user including a form that was previously filled out by the user. The user then resends this form, in a hidden state, onto another server. This is not the same as copying data from a second form of a second page to a hidden form of a first page. Rather, Markus is only disclosing one server utilizing a user as an intermediary to send a single form already filled out by a user onto a different server.

In addition, applicant can find no disclosure or suggestion in Markus of copying the data without posting the data from a second form to a server. In fact, the cited portion of Markus only discusses various server involvements in transferring a form. This teaches the opposite of the cited feature of claim 1. Therefore, Markus does not disclose the cited feature of claim 1.

As neither Kennedy nor Markus individually disclose or suggest copying data from a second form of a second page to a hidden form of a first page without posting the data from the second form to a server, any combination of Kennedy and Markus does not disclose or suggest such a feature. Therefore, claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, is patentable over Kennedy in view of Markus.

Independent claims 9, 15, 19, and 22 also disclose, in part, copying data from a second form of a second page to a hidden form of a first page without posting the data from

the second form to a server. As discussed above, Kennedy in view of Markus does not disclose or suggest such a feature. Therefore, claims 9, 15, 19, and 22, as well as their respective independent claims, are patentable over Kennedy in view of Markus for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy et al., in view of Markus et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hills et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,239,797). Applicant submits that the present claim is patentable over Kennedy and Markus, in view of Hills. Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over Kennedy in view of Markus. Hills does not remedy the defects of Kennedy in view of Markus in light of claim 1. Therefore, claim 5 is patentable over Kennedy and Markus, in view of Hills.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: March 27, 2006



Ashley R. Ott
Reg. No. 55,515

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980